

2. Details of Investigation

Appointed Officer- Inspt Eddie Charlton

Both PC Wakefield and PC 2101 Smith were asked for their views of their interaction with Mr Daugherty.

They have both provided e mails of their involvement in the investigation.

Hampshire Constabulary Record Management System (RMS) examined.

-Mr Daugherty was given an adult caution on the 01/12/2009 for Harassment against Westley Vincett.

-RMS 44070115040 refers to an allegation of assault which PC 2101 Smith investigated in 2007. The RMS Entry dated the 21/03/2007 indicates that the complainant was advised of the outcome but was advised to stay away from the suspect as well. This has been confirmed by the complainant.

I have spoken to the recipient of the recorded delivery letter, Mr Matthew Winder, who states that 'all' the letters given to Mr Vincett, were given with their permission, as they were all aware of the vendetta Daugherty has had against Mr Vincett.

I have made several attempts to communicate with the complainant to deal with this complaint which has taken some time to resolve. I have tried calling his mobile number on a regular basis. I have written to him requesting a meeting on several occasions which was finally followed up by the final letter dated the 25th of March 2010, which I also e mailed to him. The complainant stated that he did not open previous letters as they had been delivered by second class post. I finally managed to speak to him on Friday the 2nd of April at 2200hrs where we discussed his concerns.

Since this conversation, I have received another long e mail, in which he continues to raise issues which clearly relate to the same matters as those we had already discussed and in which he makes further comments relating to actions which have already proved to be unfounded.

3. Facts of Case / Evidence**Complaint 1 and 2**

I have spoken to PC Wakefield at length regarding the allegations that have been made. He states that he took some considerable time to advise the complainant regarding the correct course of action and has confirmed that his investigation showed that the letters were not stolen or interfered with. The result was communicated to the complainant but this did not resolve the complainant's determination to continue to press on regarding these matters. PC Wakefield agrees that he did receive further emails but did not reply to them as they were non specific.

It became clear at the meeting with Mr Dougherty that he had no evidence to support his allegation of theft, but regardless of the facts he continued to create reasons to corroborate what he was saying.

Mr Winder, an independent third party in relation to the theft of mail states that there has been no theft or interception of mail.

An entry has been made on RMS recording a counter allegation of theft of mail but it is not recorded as a crime as there is irrefutable evidence that no crime took place.

RMS shows that the allegation of assault was correctly recorded and investigated to a conclusion where the correct and proper outcome was a caution for the complainant. A review of this investigation finds nothing supporting Mr Daugherty's allegation that it was not fair or impartial.

Mr Daugherty is clearly not happy with this and continues to allege wrong doing.

There are no other lines of enquiries to be made regarding this incident. The actions of the officers took at the time appear correct.

Complaint 3

PC Smith states that the complainant was updated regarding the result of the assault in 2007.

RMS shows on an entry dated the 21/03/2007 that the complainant was advised of the outcome and was advised to stay away from the suspect as well.

I discussed this issue with Mr Dougherty at our meeting and he agreed that the officer's entries were in fact correct and he had been notified of the outcome.

Complaint 4

I can confirm that no letter has been sent to Mr Daugherty containing the information which he requests. He was provided the result of the investigation and this complies with the Victim's charter.

I have recorded on the RMS as to the reasons why a letter has not been sent, and the complainant has been updated of these facts. This has been supported by an entry from the IMU assessment officers in compliance with the victim's charter. There are great concerns that any letter provided would be used for other means than the personal use of the complainant, thus resurrecting old problems again. This is supported by the contents of Mr Daugherty's personal website. He refuted my fears of his intention for the request but I believe that the previous history of what has happened supports my view that this would have been used to publicise his continued interest in Mr Vincett, and create further problems.